

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

THE COUNTY OF JEFFERSON, MISSOURI	§	
% Ms. Beth Mahn, Collector	§	
Jefferson County Administration	§	
Center	§	Case No. 4:09-CV-554-SNLJ
729 Maple Street	§	
Hillsboro, MO 63050	§	
Plaintiff,	§	Jury Trial Demanded
v.	§	
TYLER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.	§	
Serve: Registered Agent	§	
Capital Corporate Services, Inc.	§	
222 E. Dunklin, Suite 102	§	
Jefferson City, MO 65101	§	
Defendant.	§	

DEFENDANT TYLER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S
MOTION AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT FOR LEAVE TO FILE A SURREPLY
TO PLAINTIFF'S REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO REMAND

Pursuant to Local Rule 7—4.01(c) Defendant Tyler Technologies, Inc. (“Tyler”) moves the Court for leave to file a Surreply to Plaintiff’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Remand, and in support thereof states as follows:

1. On April 10, 2009, Tyler removed this action to this Court.
2. On April 27, 2009, The County of Jefferson, Missouri (“Plaintiff”) filed a Motion to Remand this case to the Circuit Court of the 23rd Judicial Circuit, Jefferson County, Missouri, and for Award of Attorney Fees and Expenses.

3. On May 4, 2009, Tyler filed its Response in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and For Award of Attorney Fees and Expenses.

4. On May 11, 2009, Plaintiff filed its Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Remand (the "Reply").

5. The parties have fully addressed the legal basis for their respective positions in the Motion to Remand and Response in Opposition. Tyler does not attempt to rehash those arguments, but rather, seeks to correct a misstatement of fact by Plaintiff included its Reply.

6. On page 3 of its Reply, Plaintiff, speaking of Article 13 (the forum selection clause at issue in this case) incorrectly and without evidentiary support states that "**The parties specifically negotiated this provision . . .**" (Pl.'s Reply p. 3) Pursuant to Local Rule 7—401.(a), "if [a] motion requires consideration of facts not appearing in the record, the party also shall file all documentary evidence relied upon." *Id.* Plaintiff has not provided any evidentiary support for this statement as required by Local Rule 7—401(a). More importantly, however, this statement is false and patently misleading. Article 13 was not specifically negotiated by the parties. Rather, Article 13 is a standard provision that was drafted by Tyler and has been included as a matter of course in its contracts since 2005. Tyler seeks leave from this Court to submit a Surreply and supporting affidavit of John R. Baker, who was directly involved in the negotiations, to correct the factual record before for the Court.

WHEREFORE, Tyler respectfully requests that this Court GRANT its Motion for Leave to File a Surreply to Plaintiff's Reply and such further relief to which it is justly entitled.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Andrew B. Russell

Craig W. Budner
Texas State Bar No. 03313730
Andrew B. Russell
Texas State Bar No. 24034661
Courtney Barksdale Perez
Texas State Bar No. 24061135
K&L Gates LLP
1717 Main Street
Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201
P:(214) 939-5500
F:(214) 939-5849
craig.budner@klgates.com
andrew.russell@klgates.com
courtney.perez@klgates.com

Steven E. Garlock
E.D. Missouri Bar No. 3184
B. Matthew Struble
E.D. Missouri Bar No. 498813
Thompson Coburn LLP
One US Bank Plaza
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
P: (314) 552-6000
F: (314) 552-7425
sgarlock@thompsoncoburn.com
mstruble@thompsoncoburn.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT TYLER
TECHNOLOGIES, INC.**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing instrument was served upon all counsel of record by the Court's electronic filing system on May 12, 2009.

/s/ Andrew B. Russell